

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication in the instant Office Action that claim 25 is allowable over the cited art and would be in condition for allowance if amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection set forth in the Office Action.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. Claims 2-12, 15, 16, 19-22 and 25 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicants regard as their invention. Moreover, claim 1 has canceled without prejudice in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Support for the above amendments can be found throughout the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added by virtue of this amendment.

II. 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph Rejections

Claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. Specifically, the instant Office Action states that the expression "the second bias voltage terminal" recited in claim 25 does not correspond to the structure of Fig. 3 of the present application on the grounds that Fig. 3

does not show that the N⁺ region 360 (a first-type diffusion region of the third well) is connected the “second bias voltage region” and thus the claim is indefinite.

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, claim 25 has been amended to change the expressions “first bias voltage terminal” on line 3 to “bias voltage terminal”, “second bias voltage terminal” on line 7 to “first voltage terminal”, “third bias voltage terminal” on line 8 to “second voltage terminal”, “the second bias voltage terminal” on line 11 to “the first voltage terminal” and “the third bias voltage terminal” on line 16, to “the second voltage terminal”.

It is further noted that the Examiner indicated in a telephone conference with the undersigned on July 2, 2007 that the above-mentioned changes made to claim 25 herein would overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Therefore, withdrawal of the above rejections to claim 25 is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

(i) Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,576,557 to Ker et al. (“the Ker patent”).

As noted above, claim 25 has been indicated in the instant Office Action as being allowable over the Ker patent. Applicants respectfully submit that at the very least, for similar reasons as to claim 25, Ker likewise fails to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claims 12 and 19, as amended.


Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 12 and 19 is requested. As claims 12-18 depend from claim 12 and claims 20-24 depend from claim 19, withdrawal of the rejection to these dependent claims is likewise requested. Moreover, as claims 2-11 now depend from claim 25, withdrawal of the rejections to claims 2-11 is likewise requested.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Early notice to that end is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in furthering prosecution of the subject application, applicants request that the undersigned be contacted at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott L. Appelbaum
Reg. No. 41,587
Attorney for Applicants

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
Tel: (516) 692-8888
Fax: (516) 692-8889